

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

**THEADA WRIGHT III,
Petitioner,**

v.

**DOUGLAS DRETKE, DIRECTOR,
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL
JUSTICE, CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS
DIVISION
Respondent.**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 4:06-CV-0243-Y

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
AND NOTICE AND ORDER**

This cause of action was referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), as implemented by an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. The findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge are as follows:

I. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. NATURE OF THE CASE

This is a petition for writ of habeas corpus by a state prisoner under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

B. PARTIES

Petitioner Theada Wright III, TDCJ-ID #1076397, is in custody of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, and is presently incarcerated in Fort Stockton, Texas.

Respondent Douglas Dretke is the Director of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division. No service has issued on Respondent.

C. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURE HISTORY

On December 3, 2001, Wright was adjudicated guilty of sexual assault in the Criminal District Court Number Three of Tarrant County, Texas, Case No. 0609705D, and sentenced to six years' confinement. (Petition at 2.) Wright has filed a previous federal petition for writ of habeas corpus challenging the same state court conviction, which was denied on limitations grounds on October 1, 2004. *Wright v. Dretke*, No. 4:04-CV-582-A.¹ This petition was filed on April 1, 2006.²

D. SUCCESSIVE

28 U.S.C. § 2244(b) requires dismissal of a second or successive petition filed by a state prisoner under § 2254 unless specified conditions are met. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1)-(2).³ The fact that the earlier petition was denied on limitations grounds does not remove the subsequent petition from the second-successive requirements of § 2244(b). *See Hooker v. Sivley*, 187 F.3d 680, 682 (5th Cir. 1999); *Anders v. Cockrell*, No. 03:02-CV-2513-N, 2003 WL 102615, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 8, 2003) (not designated for publication); *Somerville v. Cockrell*, No. 3:02-CV-0380-L, 2002 WL

¹The court takes judicial notice of the state court records filed in Wright's prior federal habeas corpus action.

²A pro se habeas petition is filed when the petition is delivered to prison authorities for mailing. *Spotville v. Cain*, 149 F.3d 374, 377 (5th Cir. 1998).

³Specifically, 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b) provides that a claim presented in a second or successive habeas corpus application under § 2254 that was not presented in a prior application shall be dismissed unless—

(A) the applicant shows that the claim relies on a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable; or

(B)(I) the factual predicate for the claim could not have been discovered previously through the exercise of due diligence; and

(ii) the facts underlying the claim, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that, but for constitutional error, no reasonable factfinder would have found the applicant guilty of the underlying offense.

31441226, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 29, 2002) (not designated for publication). Further, before such a petition is filed in federal district court, the petitioner must move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application. *Id.* § 2244(b)(3).

From the face of the instant petition, it is apparent that this is a successive petition, and Wright has not shown he has authorization from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to file a successive petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1)-(3). This court is, therefore, without jurisdiction to consider the petition. *Id.*; *Hooker*, 187 F.3d at 681-82. Wright must first seek an order authorizing this court to consider his claims from the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. *See In re McGinn*, 213 F.3d 884, 885 (5th Cir. 2000); *Rogers v. Cockrell*, No.4:02-CV-954-Y, 2003 WL 21246099, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 14, 2003).

II. RECOMMENDATION

Wright's petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2254 should be dismissed without prejudice to Wright's right to file a motion for leave to file a successive petition in the United States District Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit under 28 U.S.C. §2244(b)(3)(A).

III. NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), each party to this action has the right to serve and file specific written objections in the United States District Court to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation within ten (10) days after the party has been served with a copy of this document. The court is extending the deadline within which to file specific written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation until May 3, 2006. The United States District Judge need only make a *de novo*

determination of those portions of the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which specific objection is timely made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(B)(1). Failure to file by the date stated above a specific written objection to a proposed factual finding or legal conclusion will bar a party, except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice, from attacking on appeal any such proposed factual finding or legal conclusion accepted by the United States District Judge. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc op. on reh'g); *Carter v. Collins*, 918 F.2d 1198, 1203 (5th Cir. 1990).

IV. ORDER

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, it is ORDERED that each party is granted until May 30, 2006, to serve and file written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation. It is further ORDERED that if objections are filed and the opposing party chooses to file a response, a response shall be filed within seven (7) days of the filing date of the objections.

It is further ORDERED that the above-styled and numbered action, previously referred to the United States Magistrate Judge for findings, conclusions, and recommendation, be and hereby is returned to the docket of the United States District Judge.

SIGNED May 9, 2006.

/s/ Charles Bleil
CHARLES BLEIL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE